Atlantis Vol. 12 No. 2
Spring/Printemps 1987

Research and Resources for Feminist Peace Studies

Barbara Roberts

Peace research, like most academic enterprises, has tended to focus on the male population and experience of war and "peace," and thus unwittingly to exclude the lived experience of women in daily life, in peace and war, women's practices of peacemaking, and women's insights. Women have become invisible in the discourse, their absence, among the chronicles of "men of goodwill," itself becoming invisible. Despite the best intentions, inattention to over half of humanity has deprived the research of crucial insights and resources. The following survey is meant to identify some of these, and suggest some of their potential.

Women and men have different perspectives on violence, war and peace (Roberts, 1984; Reardon, 1983, 1985; McAllister, 1982; Wiser, 1984). First, the most common form of physical violence in our society is violence against women by men. Second, women suffer more than men from structural inequality and institutionalised violence, within every strata of society, where force is either historically distant or a last resort: that is, domination and systemic discrimination long enshrined by law or custom (Boulding, 1976, 1977; Boulding *et al.*, 1976; Roberts, 1983a; Lernoux, 1980; Rogers, 1980; ISIS, 1984). Third, women have little say in the political decisions that lead to war, and virtually none in stopping it once started. Women both as civilians and simply as women are targets for attack, including sexual attack in peace as well as in war. In fact, womanhating is a fundamental part of military training (Sampson, 1977, pp 336-7; Michalowski, 1982; Eisenhart, 1975). Fourth, women are statistically more peaceful than men; despite historical evidence that some women can be as bloodyminded and militaristic as their brothers, there is increasing evidence that women as a whole are characteristically more cooperative, nurturing, and constructive than men (Roberts, 1984; Wiser and Roberts, 1985; Gilligan, 1981). This is not to deny that men can (and some do) behave in these ways (Gilligan, 1983); however, these men are very much in the minority.

Peace studies, like other disciplines, can benefit from the recognition that women and men have very different life experiences, life chances and life choices. Marxist scholar Phillip Corrigan points out that human capacity is limited or developed by particular social forms in historical circumstances (Corrigan, 1984), and gender has been one of the most significant of these shaping forms. The different life paths of women give us access to different resources than those developed by the male experience; these resources are badly needed today when the existence of all life on earth is gravely threatened.

Violence, whether domestic or national, is based on concepts of sovereignty and hierarchy. It is characteristically (that is, statistically) male to presume that relationships operate by the rules of dominance (power-over) rather than mutuality, interdependence (power-with), and empowerment (power-within). In training himself for violence—whether domestic or national—the attacker must dehumanise both himself and the "enemy," so that his normal human awareness of connectedness and kinship between him and his "target" will not hinder the attack. To dehumanise and objectify, it has been shown, is part of normal masculine training to separate feeling from thinking (Reynaud, 1983; Woodcock, 1984). Boys don't cry. Men must act on the basis of "principles" stripped of the flesh of human relationships, priding themselves on other forms of moral and emotional insulation. This insulation is a common element in boys' contempt for girls and "sissy" feelings. In at least ten to twenty-five percent of men, dehumanisation develops into violence, in their propensity to dominate, harass, batter and rape women and sexually abuse girls, and in the barrackroom (or lockerroom) training to see the "enemy" as "broads," "wogs," "slopes," and "cunts." Men who will not fight are "a bunch of women": potential victims of either side. (Roberts, 1983a, 1984; Eisenhart, 1975).

It is not just soldiers who commit atrocities (Brownmiller, 1976). Thirty-five percent of North American male university students surveyed report they would rape if they could get

away with it: several different studies confirm that the proportion is at least one in three. At the University of Manitoba in 1981, a third said they would never use force to get sex; a third said they would use force, and almost two-thirds said they would use force/rape, if they knew they would not get caught (Malamuth and Briere, 1981; Malamuth, 1981). Many carry these attitudes into action. As studies show, levels of forced sex are high in every social class. In North America: one in four girls (and perhaps one in eleven boys) is sexually abused by age eighteen; one woman in five (some studies suggest one in three) is raped in her lifetime; at least one in ten Canadian women are battered by their spouses; some estimates suggest that violence occurs in half of all intimate relationships (Roberts, 1983a).

Propensity for violence against women *may* be a majority rather than minority characteristic: if one victim equals one assailant (an assumption open to question), then over fifty percent of men are in fact assaultive. All the available evidence suggests that assailants cannot be distinguished from other men by psychological tests. However, assaultive men appear to think it acceptable to impose their authority by violence, are contemptuous of and indifferent to their victims' feelings, deny the extent of harm and do not take responsibility for their own feelings, actions, and their consequences. (Roberts, 1983a, 1984; Stacey and Sharpe, 1983). Women and children must be controlled and kept in our "place" by any necessary means. Sexual assailants tend to have contempt for and believe demeaning myths about women (we deserve/enjoy it, no means yes, we don't really suffer, we don't respect men who take no for an answer, we must be kept in line). Child sexual abusers appear to be outwardly respectable husbands and fathers, who are domineering and authoritarian at home, claim to see nothing wrong with using violence to maintain "discipline," and either deny the assault, or if caught, claim it was harmless or educational, or shift the blame onto the girl or wife. The profile of batterers is very similar: unwillingness and inability to take responsibility for his feelings, actions, and their consequences (Roberts, 1983a, 1984). There are astonishing parallels, both in macho authoritarianism and in their sexual violence, in the police and military terror in Latin America (Lernoux, 1980).

Both direct physical violence and systemic or structural violence provide or support male recreation, male access to female labour and resources, enforcement of male privilege, and of the various systems of inequality and subordination in our economy and society. Violence against women helps keep women in our place. It also helps keep men in their place. Men get false power over women (and other victims) as a poor substitute for the real power to choose meaningful lives as creative, caring, competent and self-determining people.

There appear to be clear connections between male violence against women and the institutions of the state. A 1981 Swedish study of social policy concluded that the educational system was a problem: boys were still educated fairly traditionally to expect deference and services from their wives. When their wives resisted, husbands would use violence to try to assert their "authority." The study suggested that if boys as well as girls were educated for equality and shared responsibility, violence against women would diminish. But curriculum reformers "hit resistance" from the state:

> The decision makers are afraid that by teaching non-violence to boys, traditional jobs such as the army or the police will find no takers. (Dagens Nhyeter, cited in Roberts, 1983a).

The extent of male conditioning for violence (state or domestic) should not be underestimated. Let us apply the statistics to any hypothetical average North American classroom of fifteen girls and fifteen boys. Statistically speaking, between eight and twelve of the girls will be targets for an assault directed at them because of their gender: three or four will be sexually abused by age eighteen, probably by their fathers or other male caretakers; three to five will be raped in their lifetime; two or three will be battered by their husbands, and up to seven will suffer some form of physical violence from their male intimate at some point in the relationship. On the other hand, one or two of the boys may be sexually assaulted (by adult males) as children; but when they grow up, between eight and twelve of the boys will assault women. Three or four will sexually abuse little girls, often their daughters; three to five will rape women; in their late teens or early twenties, only a third of these young men would say they would never use force to get sex, five would use force, and ten would say they would use force and/or rape if they know they could get away with it. Two or three will batter their wives; up to seven will use physical violence against their women intimates at some point in the relationship (Roberts, 1983a, 1983b, 1985).

Part of the boys' masculinisation in the classroom and on the playground is learning that they are superior to, and are meant to have authority as men over girls and women. They learn also to view physical violence as a legitimate means of enforcing that god-given authority. Viewed from this perspective, "normal" boyish behaviour—contempt, dislike, teasing and baiting of girls, using disruptive tactics to capture teacher attention and maneuvring teachers into presenting

lessons in terms of male interests ("teaching to" the boys)—takes on a new meaning. (Spender, 1982; Spender and Sarah, 1980; Deem, 1978; Thompson, 1983; Brodribb and O'Brien, 1984).

Studies of schoolchildren have shown that girls' preferred social interactions are different from boys'. They dislike games whose social outcome is that players "get their feelings hurt and feel bad." As Carol Gilligan points out,

> You in fact have this microcosm of little girls who've been saying all along that they don't like to play games where people win and lose (Van Gelder, 1984).

But school curricula and practices take male values as the norm, ignoring and negatively reinforcing girls' values. By about grade six, the boys' experiences and standards become the measuring stick (Spender, 1982; Spender and Sarah, 1980). Thus the boys lose training in more humane, cooperative and caring alternatives which remain available for the girls at least in the private sphere. As Gilligan asks, "Instead of ignoring them [the girls] or thinking that there is something wrong with them, why aren't we out there *studying* them?...A crucial question for the future will be: How do we get females not to abandon what they know at eleven?" (Van Gelder, 1984).

The family is another important source of training. The North American statistics show that the father-present family is not a safe place for women and children. Of course not all North American men assult their daughters and wives; despite the statistics, I cannot believe that such behaviour is typical. Yet, some research suggests that teaching boys to be violent may be part of normal fathering (Block, 1978; Gleason, 1975). Recent work by Jean Baker Miller on the ways men are taught to deal with anger sheds light on men's training for violence. The cult of masculinity demands that boys not experience their emotions, and not take responsibility for their feelings: instead, to be men, they must focus on actions and thoughts. Baker Miller points out that men live in hierarchies of age, class, and race in family, workplace and other settings. Subordinates are likely to find themselves in situations where they have reason to be angry, thus most men experience such anger, from the time they are little boys. But anger at a superior is unacceptable and cannot be expressed—for example, a boy's to a father, a worker's to a boss. Rather than *feel* and *express* anger in these situations, boys are taught to *act* aggressively, but not against their superiors (Baker Miller, 1983). In fact, superiors are known by the overwhelming force at their disposal. This "deterrent" power is an essential tenet in the cult of masculinity. Fathers teach their sons these patterns (Block, 1978; Gleason, 1975). Fathers observed at play with their sons tended to goad even very small boys into anger, then withdraw from or punish the boys when they express anger at the fathers. Upper middle class fathers proclaiming love for their young sons were observed sparring with them, "teasing" by calling them pejorative names and otherwise pushing the boys until they erupted in anger. Baker Miller reports that "the observers in these studies were shocked at the amount of hostility conveyed and the amount of anger provoked in the children. These observations confirm stories I have heard many times in clinical work." (Baker Miller, 1983).

Swiss psychoanalyst and social theorist Alice Miller believes that such "normal" childrearing patterns are sufficiently harmful to be labelled "poisonous pedagogy" (Miller, 1983). She sees the roots of violence in hidden cruelty in childrearing. The cruel practices she describes are similar to those identified in the fathering studies discussed by Baker Miller (1983). Miller lists these rules: adults are the masters of dependent children; adults determine what is right and wrong; children are responsible for adults' anger; children's "life-affirming feelings" threaten authoritarian adults; children's "will" must be "broken" and they must be brought to heel at a tender age so they will not be aware of or able to describe or resist these methods. Children are bullied and intimidated, and taught to have "false feelings" and beliefs so they will not express anger and resentment engendered by this treatment.

Other studies have observed links between childrearing and violence; for example, Adamec and Stark-Adamec note that "nonlove-oriented child punishment" is positively correlated with high levels of violence in society (Adamec and Stark-Adamec, 1982). Peggy Reeves Sanday's cross cultural study found that societies which encourage men to be tough and aggressive, with a "primarily indifferent, aloof, cold and stern father-daughter relationship" have high levels of interpersonal violence and rape. (1982)

Alice Miller's analysis is not feminist; she does not explore differnces in male and female relationships with children, nor bring explicitly into her discussion her recognition that male bullying of children may also be directed against their mothers. Nonetheless, she and others offer insight into the perpetuation of social and domestic violence over generations and in many different cultural settings. Her "poisonous pedagogy" closely resembles the patterns identified as causes of violence against women in the family setting, and for that matter, the workings of male authority. Her authoritarian fathers' psychological profile is similar to those drawn by

feminist researchers of today's North American assaultive male.

But were (and are) brutal *mothers* commonplace? It is possible that mothers of earlier decades willingly or unwillingly shared or followed fathers' authoritarian childrearing ideology and practices and Miller's apparent gender blindness is in fact simply accurate reporting (if lacking in analysis). Current literature suggests that these are not today's mothering norms; yet elements remain in today's fathering practices. If this seems an unbalanced view of gender differences in parenting, consider the overrepresentation of men as assailants, in terms of time spent with children. As Breines and Gordon point out, even if women were responsible for fifty percent of physical (as opposed to sexual) child abuse (and there are not data to support that suggestion), because women do almost all the childcare we would still be underrepresented as child abusers (Breines and Gordon, 1983). Sara Ruddick argues that abusive mothering is an aberration caused by inadequate resources (Ruddick, 1983). Fewer women than men have the opportunity to develop and express authoritarian habits, however much we might leap at the opportunity if we had it. Evidence is overwhelming that men are responsible for nearly all child sexual abuse, despite the fact that men spend very little time with children, compared to women (Breines and Gordon, 1983; Roberts, 1983a; Luxton, 1980; Hartmann, 1981; Eichler, 1983).

Childrearing is one of the few areas of life where women have power over others, and undeniably, its use against children forms part (however small a part) of most women's experience of mothering. However, Phyllis Aronoff argues

> It's not just that patriarchy uses women's nurturing to maintain and perpetuate its values and institutions—but that women's nurturing, as we experience it, is part and parcel of patriarchy. Women have never been able to define motherhood for ourselves. I am afraid of idealizing women's nurturing and thus failing to get at the heart of what Adrienne Rich calls "the central ambiguity at the heart of patriarchy: the ideas of the sacredness of motherhood and the redemptive power of women as means, contrasted with the degradation of women in the order created by men." Experience convinces me that men are quite willing to accept the idea of women's nurturing healing the world (and themselves)—what they refuse to accept is women exercising power on our own terms (Aronoff, 1985; Rich, 1979).

What *is* power on our own terms? Power has long been a central issue in feminist research. In the early days of the Women's Liberation Movement, much energy was directed to avoiding the use of traditional types of power (referred to here as power-over), and a central tenet of the movement was that all forms of dominance and hierarchy should be eliminated. Feminist social action has aimed at empowering women and children for self determination. Discussions about the nature of power point out that there are forms of power other than dominance, forms based on what in today's feminist peace movement has come to be called "power-within" (Macy, 1983; Starhawk, 1982) or empowerment. Getting rid of dominance was seen as a necessary step toward a feminist world. More than a decade ago, Berenice Carroll applied a feminist critique of what she called the "cult of power" to malestream peace research suggesting that to do research effectively on how to bring about peace, it is necessary to

> think about power as competence rather than dominance and to explore the implications of that shift; to shake off the preoccupations with the powerful and look for the power and competence in the allegedly "powerless"; to free oneself from the confines of living and thinking in the value universe of the topdogs.

As Carroll points out, "Breaking out of the mental straitjacket of the cult of power is one of the most difficult intellectual tasks one can set oneself today...these are remarkably painful undertakings." (Carroll, 1972).

If feminists have rejected traditional forms of power-as-dominance, we have not necessarily found it easy to accept our own power-within. Jean Baker Miller has pointed out that an acceptable experience of power for women (although it is not recognised as power) is through fostering the growth of others, enchancing the power-within of others. But it is far less acceptable to foster our own power for our own purposes; that is seen as selfish (for we are not fostering others), destructive (for it will no doubt rock the boat), and in fact threatens us with attack and abandonment. She suggests that most women would feel more comfortable in a situation where we are enhancing the power of others while simultaneously increasing our own power. And without increasing our own power we cannot bring about change, let alone guarantee the existence of a setting where we may be able to foster the growth of others. (Baker Miller, 1982).

Recent feminist pacifist research has focussed on the paradox that power-over is powerlessness; that violence is ultimately an expression of powerlessness and resourcelessness (Vellacott, 1982; Rubin, 1981; Stiehm, 1982). Violent men are incompetent at taking care of themselves or others, and unwilling or unable to take responsibility for their feel-

ings and actions. If power is competence, violent men have little. Domestic or sexual violence does not threaten the interests of their rulers, whereas if men were empowered to become whole, thoughtful, feeling people, choosing to reorder and take control of their own lives in accordance with human priorities, choosing a system of cooperation based on mutual enhancement, that would deeply threaten the social order, particularly the right of other men to rule.

Power-within is based on interdependence and interconnectedness with others (Macy, 1983). Jo Vellacott speaks of powerlessness as re-source-less-ness, of being disconnected from the Source: the source of life, creation, love, joy, the human community (Vellacott, 1982). Power-within is being resourceful: full of the source; power-within is a renewable resource. Calling it woman-power, Sally Gearhart talks about women's relation to power-within as re-sourcement, based on receptivity, listening, trust and commitment in a context of collectivity (Gearhart, 1982). To relate these insights specifically to peace studies, power-within and empowerment grow out of connection to our deep responses to our present peril and our feelings of caring for each other (Macy, 1983); alienation from others and the inability to experience deep feeling are sources of powerlessness.

To say that men's power-over is based on essential resourcelessness is not to deny the very real danger such power poses for women and for humankind, given the nuclear peril we all face. Nor is the development of power-within or empowerment in itself a solution to the dilemma; empowerment for what? How can empowerment deal with and ultimately transform power-over? For example, women tend to have more skills and resources than men in conflict resolution and the promotion of cooperative and affirming interactions. Alice Wiser and I are involved in a large-scale international feminist peace research project on this topic, that grew out of Alice's experiences at the UN in Geneva in 1984; she saw a poster saying that seventy percent of the world's peacemakers are women, yet she saw none at the conference tables. Speculating that perhaps the statistic referred to everyday situations, we decided to gather empirical data on women's experiences. The research is intended to discover women's experiences of conflict resolution and peacemaking in the family, community, organisations, place of worship and place of work. Our first few hundred responses reveal that women consider that they are the main peacemakers in these settings (male respondents do not identify themselves as the main peacemakers). But even women who reported that they were very successful as peacemakers still felt powerless in relation to the international situation, and in dealing with men (Wiser and Roberts, 1985). Few of us see ourselves as skilled peacemakers, and most of our peacemaking takes place on a private rather than official basis. Our skills are not recognised, by us or by others. We need to work in groups to gain confidence and legitimacy. The next stage of our research will be carried out in group settings, and will promote empowerment as well as gather data, by the group process. We hope the participants will feel more powerful and have more impact if they can act together as peacemakers. An important question for peace research today is, how can women's peacemaking skills and resources be transformed into a source of power to remake the world into a safe place for all creatures?

How do children learn to operate from power-within rather than domination? Recent research on mothering offers insights. Sara Ruddick suggests that female socialisation trains girls in "preservative love," which she defines as caring for creatures whose wellbeing is at risk. Preservative love is not inherently female but rather learned. If motherwork under proper conditions (freely chosen and adequately supported) helps to create nurturing and peaceful people, then teaching men to mother, that is, raising boys more like girls, might have significant impact. If men mother, they may become "demasculinised" as they learn to nurture and cooperate and be connected to others, sufficiently that their ways of dealing with feeling and relationships may become part of the solution instead of part of the problem. Some suggestions have been made that men must become more involved in fathering; yet at the moment a father-present family constitutes a danger for the female members, and fathers' interactions with boys seem to be a source of boys' training to be feeling-less and aggressive. Clearly fathering needs redefining if it is to have the desirable effects that feminist thinkers believe to be associated with motherwork, both for the children and for the motherworkers (Ruddick, 1983a, 1983b, Chodorow, 1978; Roberts, 1983a; Block, 1978; Gleason, 1975).

Carol Gilligan's research on female patterns of moral development is a great importance for feminist peacework, including conflict resolution and negotiation. Gilligan points out that females are trained to pose moral questions in the context of interconnectedness and responsibility—that is, how a given action will affect others. Males, on the other hand, are trained to abstract these questions from their context, and measure them against an absolute principle—right or wrong. For women, the ultimate nightmare is to be isolated from others; for men to be enmeshed. Ironically, the nightmare of one is the comfortable norm of the other (Gilligan, 1977, 1979, 1981).

Our present patterns of male and female training may also directly impair our abilities to find alternatives to our present

dilemma. For example, differences in psychological starting points may have their intellectual counterparts. Some of us recall psychology's pejorative labelling of women as "field-dependent"; men were able to analyse while we were stuck in the context and could not get outside to function effectively. While this research has been justly criticised on grounds of bias, method, and inconsistency (Weisstein, 1971), modern developmental and social theorists urge us to look afresh at the value of a holistic or "systems thinking" approach (Smith, 1981; Copp and Kirkpatrick, 1979; Gilligan, 1981; Macy, 1983; Russell, 1983). As well, the history of science and thought has given us insight into the origins of the "masculine" mode of operation (Easlea, 1983; Merchant, 1980). What was rather sneeringly called field-dependence is in fact the ability to see the whole pattern while taking its parts into account. An inability to remain grounded in the context while making decisions is a real handicap. Moreover, the "new" physics and several other branches of science are far more compatible with the "female" intellectual pattern than the male (Capra, 1976, 1982; Russell, 1983; Meyers *et al.*, 1984; McWaters, 1984). When female experiences and values as norms to follow are eliminated from our schools and more generally from our culture, males too fail to reach their full potential. Masculinity, it seems, is an increasing handicap in the real world.

Conversely, normal female patterns offer badly needed resources. As Jean Baker Miller and others have pointed out, women's experiences and traditions show great strength (Baker Miller, 1976, 1982). Even in a nonnuclear world, the survival of most of the world's people would depend on our efforts. Not only do we do two-thirds of the world's work, and in some parts of Africa produce nearly all the food, we also perform the daily tasks of creating the human community, and a good deal of the intellectual work upon which male hegemony is based. (ISIS, 1984; Rubin, 1976; Smith, 1978).

The writings of a whole host of female thinkers from a variety of traditions describe the development of what Interhelper Fran Peavey calls "heart politics" (Peavey, 1985): the politics of connectedness and responsibility. One of its clearest presentations is the 1980 Women's Pentagon Action Statement which says, in part,

> We understand all is connectedness. The earth nourishes us as we with our bodies will eventually feed it. Through us, our mothers connected the human past to the human future.

The fact that, like all humans, we are born of women links us to past, present and future. Some writers link the existence and fate of all living creatures on the planet; indeed link us to the planet herself as a living organism (the Gaia hypothesis). Others speak of the ties between all women, some of the sisterhood even of man. Whatever their focus, these writers share the view that our politics must be based on the recognition that "we are all part of one another," to quote Barbara Deming (Meyerding, 1984). The despair we feel in the face of the destruction of all creatures and of the planet, is caused by our feeling of interconnectedness with all beings; that same feeling of interconnectedness is our source of great power and strength (Macy, 1983). This recognition is the basis of the work of Interhelp, the international network founded by Joanna Macy.

Operating with intentionality from this base of connectedness plugs us in to a renewable re-source of energy which not only keeps us going without burnout but is an infinite source of power to change and heal the world and each other. Various theorists and activists develop programmes from this starting point. Sally Gearhart's model of political action envisions what she calls "zones of re-sourcement" where womanpower or power-within is developed and renewed; these zones function not only as locations somewhat like safe houses (made possible and safe only by the work of women in the "war zone") that is, as places we can go not only for rest and recharging, but also where we can develop the fundamental personal and psychic changes needed to make new people who can live peacefully in the postrevolutionary world (Gearhart, 1982). Elise Boulding has written about the people we need for that world (Boulding, 1976). Various peace activists are helping us to become those kinds of people. Sonia Johnson's workshops on visioning a feminist world, Elise Boulding's on a peaceful future, and the workshops of Alice Wiser, Dorothy Carroll Lenk and Mary Ann Beall (Beall, Lenk and Wiser, 1984) on empowering ourselves to build a peaceful world, and work of many people in the Interhelp network (Therapy Now, 1984; Macy, 1983), are based on this approach. Political action in which how we get there is as important as where we get, where the personal is as important as and inseparable from the political, which concentrates on what is usually called "process," with consensual decision making and planning, is based on this politics of connectedness and responsibility. Examples are described by those writing about Greenham Common (Cook and Kirk, 1983; Harford and Hopkins, 1984), about the Seneca camp (Pilon, 1983), and LUNA (Lesbians United in Non-nuclear Action) and the Lesbian Tide participation in the Seabrook action (Foglia and Wolffberg, 1982), Starhawk's (1982) account of the Diablo Canyon actions, and others (McAllister, 1982).

Heart politics is also a form of people-shaping; not only a process but a product. Peacemaking must be connected to being as well as behaviour. A peaceful world requires justice and equality so that people *can* be peaceful. Any form of violence against any member of the community, be it direct physical or indirect structural violence, is a violation of community. Marge Piercy's future people in *Woman on the edge of time* are one example of how we might be and behave in a peaceful world (Piercy, 1980). Ernest Callenbach's *Ecotopia emerging* looks at the process of becoming peaceful as we develop that world (Callenbach, 1982). The vision of heart politics presupposes that making ourselves and the world peaceful is an interactive process. What also distinguishes heart politics is that its advocates and practitioners focus not exclusively on opposition to the negative but also on discerning and developing the positive; not only on what we turn away from, but on where we are facing, where we are heading.

Feminist research offers us resources for peace preparations. This is crucial because getting rid of weapons would not automatically create a peaceful society. The social relations and systems of violence and inequality, and the types of people produced by these systems, would remain. We would still have what Barbara Starrett calls the death pattern or the Vampire (Starrett, 1982). Peace preparations, then, involve more fundamental and revolutionary changes than ending "war."

In a brilliant essay called "Peace on earth, goodwill toward women," Alice Wiser warns: "If you are not a feminist then you haven't even begun to think about peace. You've only thought of stopping war or stopping the arms race, of non-war. The distinction between being against something and being for something is enormous." Wiser develops a six stage model of peace work, each with its own goals, mindset and methods.

> (1) Antiwar; action from fear and frustration, excitement replacing despair; the problem is political, and "out there." This is the stage at which she sees the majority of people in the peace movement today.
>
> (2) Beginning awareness of the connection between personal lives and war and peace issues; involvement of social justice and peace activists in personal actions such as tax or military service resistance; simplifying daily life. High burnout and dropout rate, much self doubt.
>
> (3) Women emerge as a group, realising that gender injustice and skewed ways of conceptualising and acting are pervasive, even in the peace and social justice work we have been doing. Malestream models and methods questioned, search for deep causes of violence, based on lived experience. A new world view, new methods begin development among women. This is the first real peace-work. Most men have no idea of this process, and keep doing stage two work, saying "women's issues" are not real peace issues.
>
> (4) A new vision of peace begins to be developed. Antiwar work continues, but is seen as a step toward the peaceful world of justice, equality, community. Most men have trouble doing this; women learn fast.
>
> (5) Assumption of personal responsibility and often drastic personal change; commitment to risktaking in daily life to root out sources of violence. Learning to live peacefully; remaking institutions and people. Attention to feelings; process, morality and ethics (a la Gilligan, not in some abstract way) is an important part of this work.
>
> (6) Collaboratively designing and implementing new systems and structures to make visions reality. Revolution: complete, from the inside out and the bottom up; peaceful, joyous revolution (Wiser, 1984).

Changing the discouse is an important part of antiwar and propeace work. Dorothy Smith and others have helped us to see that the discourse in which the intellectual, political, economic, spiritual and even interpersonal business of human society is carried out does not reflect the experiences, perspectives, interest and priorities of women (Smith, 1974, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1981a, 1981b; Ng, 1982). A major emphasis in past and present feminist thought has been the importance of naming and putting forward all these things and having them seen as legitimate. The discourse of the peace movement reflects masculinist perspectives and methods; elsewhere I have called it the discourse of "machothink" (Roberts, 1984).

What would it mean to have a feminist discourse in the peace movement, or more accurately in the antiwar movement? For example, it would mean that we personalise the war machine. We locate war preparations as specific acts or decisions taken by individuals whom we name and locate in their work and family contexts. This requires biographical and corporate research of a relatively simple sort. War preparations are immensely profitable for those people who control large corporations involved in weapons and military research, production and sales. They are immensely costly for the rest of us because our taxes pay the millions of dollars of subsidies for war industries. Investment in so-called "de-

fence" spending creates very few jobs (fewer than almost any other kind of investment), each one of them requiring huge capital costs. Military spending also takes away money needed to provide for essential human needs such as clean water, food, health care, and education, and providing these services would at the same time create for more jobs than investing the same amount in the military section (Sivard, 1983; Smith and Smith, 1983; Enloe, 1983). In fact, with the money spent on arms in the world for only a few minutes, all the world's people could be given safe water sources.

Which corporations are profiting directly from militarisation? Why are corporations permitted to do this? Who are the men who make the laws that protect the death merchants? Who are the men who choose to make or sell weapons at the cost of hunger, thirst and ill health for so many other people? (Project on the Present Danger, 1984; Sampson, 1977; Easlea, 1983). Do these men have families? Children? These men who are the war planners are preparing the means for not only our deaths but the deaths of their own family members. Changing the discourse means to talk publicly about those facts, and about these men as named individuals making specific decisions, not as abstract parts of the system or unnamed monsters. A feminist discourse on these issues will turn the discussion back to the personal as political, and the political as personal.

A feminist discourse would also mean that we personalise the effects of war preparations on our own lives. Many of the most important parts of our lives are affected by militarisation; how we feed, clothe and shelter ourselves, with whom we live under what circumstances, if we have kids and how and by whom they will be cared for; what choice we have about any of the foregoing, and what we can do to complain or change something we do not like (Enloe, 1983). These are all political issues; the limits on our lives are set in large part by the decisions of the men whose own lives and fortunes are tied in with war preparations.

For an easily understood example of how we might talk about war preparation and our own lives, let's assume that all of us reading this have kids in one big campus daycare, and as we go on about our business it becomes clear to us that the men who talk in offices and classrooms all over campus are planning to torture and kill our kids. These men use terms like "destructive capacity," "deterrence" and "theatre of operation"—but we now know with certainty that it is our kids in the daycare they are describing. And we can't just go and get them out of the daycare. First stop and think about this situation. How do we *feel* about this? Do we feel fear, horror, rage, grief, shock, hopelessness and a determination that we will not let this happen? These very intense feelings are as appropriate to our present real life situation as they are to the hypothetical situation described here (Macy, 1983). Returning to our hypothetical daycare, how do we stop their deaths? Do we continue to sit obediently in our meeting rooms and allow the planners to prattle on? Do we continue to talk in the language of these men? It seems unlikely. Would we not say, "hey wait a minute, we won't let you do that," or "what do you mean, theatre of operation, that's my life, my body you're talking about!" Just as in that hypothetical situation we must insist that the covert plans for our children's deaths be openly acknowleged and our collaboration refused, in our actual situation today we must transform the discourse to insist that the human element be included in any talk by anyone at any level for any purpose, about war. That includes the effects of their plans on our physical, emotional, spiritual selves; the sights, sounds and smells their plans imply for us. It includes our feelings about what is being planned for us.

It follows that we must insist that those who calmly discuss war plans without reference to this human context are crazy: mentally ill, insane, out of touch with reality. We must change the ground of the discourse and speak from our whole lives. This is not an abstract academic issue, it is a moral and personal issue. When we allow machothink and nukespeak to define the rules of discourse for us, we are complicitous by our silence. We must name what's going on and who is doing it.

This has painful consequences. (1) We'll be attacked. (2) We'll go crazy ourselves because if we think and talk and feel about these horrors we can't stand it. Those of us who have been involved in rape crisis, child sexual abuse or wife battering resistance and support work have already experienced this. Going crazy is appropriate but inconvenient. There are ways to stay sane: despair and empowerment work, support groups, other feminist resources (Oldring Sydiaha, 1985; Macy, 1983; Therapy Now, 1984).

The act of naming is in itself a healing act. Berit As, the Norwegian feminist peaceworker, was invited to the Couchiching conference in 1982. She found it dominated by men preparing for war, who used a number of techniques familiar to us to make the peaceworkers feel discredited or crazy; ignoring them, telling they they were wrong or lying, treating them like objects. Berit found herself physically ill and mentally paralysed after a couple of days, which was awkward because she was supposed to give a talk to the conference. What saved her was to realise that when the machothinkers talked about "theatres of operation" that might be nuked in Europe, they were talking about millions of women, men,

and children who were Berit's family, friends and neighbours—and she felt a good deal of pain and grief and absolute outrage at what they were planning and how they were describing it. And that is the substance of what she said at her talk. She told us later that this experience had convinced her that we must always speak up and insist that the truth be told about what was going on. It would heal us and help to change the definition of the situation. Moreover, the act of naming is an empowering act. When we name what is going on, we then can more easily have access to our feelings about it. Our feelings are an important source of energy and power (Macy, 1983; Starhawk, 1982; Therapy Now, 1984). As well, naming ends our complicity in the doublespeak which helps to make the potential victims acquiesce in the assault.

We sometimes hesitate to speak up because we do not feel informed about weapons systems, strategies, and military language; we cannot speak easily about the war games played by our "defenders." Fortunately we do not all need to become experts on the methods by which the war planners intend to annihilate us, in order to tell them and each other that we will not allow them to do this. This is not to say that facts about the arms race and militarisation, about corporate capitalism, the state, government policy, vested interests etc. are unimportant. They are very important. Most of them are also readily available. What we must do is to insist that these facts are not the only or even the most important information that must be discussed. We must not feel that we have to be able to reel off data about armaments and war in order to discuss peace. We do not need to learn the war planners' pornographic discourse of objectification, dehumanisation, hate and death; we need to change it. We are already experts in the most important parts of the discourse we need to use. We live, we love, we learn and work and struggle together, we have hope and joy in each other and in the beauty of the world around us. That is what we say "yes" to, and what we must speak about. And that, I believe is where transformation begins.

Women are too often silenced by accusations that we are just being emotional. These accusations can be refuted in several ways. First, our emotions of grief and despair are a sane and appropriate response to the situation; when they are accepted and experienced, they can be positive and useful. Our despair and outrage come from our sense of connectedness to all around us; that same caring and sense of connectedness are a source of great power. Thus, "being emotional" is not only appropriate, but a pragmatic step toward changing the situation. Second, it is crucial to realise that accusations such as "being emotional" obscure the power relations inherent in discourse. He who controls the discourse defines the terms in which discussion can be carried out (Smith, 1978). She who challenges and redefines the discourse is engaged in important and powerful political work. A discourse based in and expressing our lived experience, our connections to others and our "preservative love" (a commitment to the well-being of creatures at risk, as Ruddick defines it, and we are indeed creatures at risk, 1983) for them, is a discourse based on the language of immanence, of power-within, and hence, is full of power (Starhawk, 1982; Roberts, 1984).

How did the discourse of machothink arise? Carolyn Merchant, the historian of science, analyses the intellectual shift in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when men removed the life or spirit from the natural world, then began to tinker with the machine they had created, with little care for the damage done to the natural or human environment or the human community (Merchant, 1980; Easlea, 1983). Their tinkering has produced a technology for profit and privilege for a few, rather than for fulfilling basic human needs for all people. Technology is simply a tool; it could as easily serve human need as the greed of its controllers. Our economic, political and social systems exist in their present forms because those who were in charge of their development did not believe that they had to take responsibility for the consequences of their decisions, actions and priorities. This kind of decontextualised thinking is fundamentally necessary for the creation of the planetary survival crises we face today. (As a marxist feminist I hasten to add that it is necessary but not sufficient for their creation.)

We must hook up ourselves and the rest of the world, including the natural world, back together again; reground ourselves in the natural material world and recognise that we are all alive and part of the same web of life; a term which Rachel Carson used more than twenty years ago in *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962).

Peace preparations (what I mean by feminist peacework) demand the development of a transformative vision of a peaceful world, and the training of ourselves and others to build and live in it. We must become re-sourceful and reconnected to each other and to our sources of humanity and creation. It is especially important for men to reclaim and redefine male personhood and humanity, because their present forms often make men part of the problem rather than part of the solution. Redefined male personhood would include sharing the world's work, including nurturing, motherwork and housework.

William Blake talked about energy as eternal delight. If $e=mc^2$, then our material would and we are a process of eternal

delight in which we must reclaim our part. This is do-able. The same sources that help us stay sane while we try to stop the insane from killing us, help us to vision and to rediscover enery and delight. I referred earlier to the development of human capacities in particular social forms and historical circumstances; I am referring to here the exploration of the "human capacity" side of the equation, at the same time as we explore and arrange the "social forms" side. There are known and effective methods for building peaceful people. We have maps for that exploration. We must not be deterred by the super-rational malestream discourse from exploring moral and spiritual issues or approaches, and we must not attack each other for our differences. Our diversity may help to save us, if we claim it as a resource for the transformation of ourselves and our world.

REFERENCES

Arnoff, Phyllis. Letter to author, March, 1985.

As, Berit. "A materialistic view of men's and women's attitudes towards war." *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 5 No. 3/4, 1983.

Avery, Michael, *et al. Building united judgement. A handbook for consensus decision making*. Madison, Wisconsin: The Center for Conflict Resolution, 1981.

Baker Miller, Jean. "The construction of anger in women and men." Work in Progress Series. Stone Center, Wellesley College, 1983.

Baker Miller, Jean. "Women and power." Work in Progress Series. Stone Center, Wellesley College, 1982

Beall, Mary Ann; Dorothy Carroll Lenk; and Alice Wiser. "Hope." *Friends Journal*, March 1, 1984.

Block, Jeanne. "Another look at sex differentiation in the socilization behavior of mothers and fathers" in Julia Sherman and Florence Denmark, editors, *Psychology of Women. Future Directions of Research*. New York: Psychological Dimensions. 1978.

Boulding, Elise. *The Underside of History*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1976.

Boulding, Elise. *Women in the Twentieth Century World*. New York: Sage, 1977.

Boulding, Elise, *et al. Handbook of International Data on Women*. New York: Sage, 1976.

Breines, Wini and Linda Gordon. "The New Scholarship on Family Violence." *Signs* Vol. 8 No. 3, 1983.

Brodribb, Somer and Mary O'Brien, editors. *Women and Education* Special Issue of *Resources for Feminist Research* Vol. 13 No. 1, March 1984.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will. Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Bantam, 1976.

Callenbach, Ernest. *Ecotopia Emerging*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Capra, Fritjof. *The Turning Point. Science, Society and the Rising Culture*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Capra, Fritjof. *The Tao of Physics*. London: Fontana, 1976.

Carroll, Berenice. "Peace Research: The Cult of Power." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol. 5 No. 4, 1972.

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. New York: Fawcett, 1962.

Center for Constitutional Rights. "Greenham Women against Cruise Missiles," legal education pamphlet. New York: Center for Constitutional Rights, 1984.

Chapman, Jane Roberts and Margaret Gates, editors. *The Victimization of Women*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

Child sexual abuse newsletter No. 1. Vancouver: Social Planning and Research, United Way, August 1981.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Clark, Lorenne and Debra Lewis. *Rape. The price of coercive sexuality*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1977.

Christ, Carol. *Diving Deep and Surfacing. Women writers on spiritual quest*. Boston: Beacon, 1980.

Cook, Alice and Gwyn Kirk. *Greenham Women Everywhere. Dreams, ideas and actions from the women's peace movement*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Coover, Virginia, *et al. Resource Manual for a Living Revolution*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1978.

Copp, Claire and Martha Kirkpatrick, editors. "Characteristics," chapter two in *Becoming Female. Perspectives on Development*. New York: Plenum, 1979.

Corrigan, Philip. "Marxism and Cultural Theory," paper to the Annual Meeting of the Society for Socialist Studies. Guelph. June 1984.

Dedring, Juergen. *Recent Advances in Peace and Conflict Research*. New York: Sage, 1976.

Dedring, Juergen. "Towards Appropriate Peace Research." *Peace and Change*, Vol. 7 No. 3, 1981.

Deem, Rosemary. *Women and Schooling*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Easlea, Brian. *Fathering the Unthinkable. Masculinity, scientists and the nuclear arms race*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. *The Hearts of Men*. New York: Anchor, 1983.

Eichler, Margrit. *Families in Canada Today*. Toronto: Gage, 1983.

Eisenhart, Wayne. "You can't hack it little girl: A discussion of the covert psychological agenda of modern combat training." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 31 No. 4, 1975.

Enloe, Cynthia. *Does Khaki Become You? The militarisation of women's lives*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group. *Piecing it Together. Feminism and Nonviolence*. London: Feminism and Nonviolence Study Group and War Resisters' International, 1983.

Finn, Geraldine and Angela Miles, editors. *Feminism in Canada. From Pressure to Politics*. Montreal: Black Rose, 1982.

Foglia, Gina and Dorit Wolffberg. "Spiritual dimensions of feminist anti-nuclear activism" in Charlene Spretnak, editor, *The Politics of Women's Spirituality*. New York: Doubleday, 1982.

Galtung, Johan. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 5 No. 3, 1969.

Gearhart, Sally. "Womanpower: Energy Re-sourcement" in Charlene Spretnak, editor, *The Politics of Women's Spirituality*. New York: Doubleday, 1982.

Gilligan, Carol. Interview CBC *Ideas* Programme, 19 April 1983.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Gilligan, Carol. "Woman's Place in Man's Life Cycle." *Harvard Education Review*, November 1979.

Gilligan, Carol. "In a Different Voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality." *Harvard Education Review*, November 1977.

Gleason, Jean. "Fathers and Other Strangers. Men's speech to young children" in Daniel P. Dato, editor, *Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics. Developmental Psycholinguistics Theory and Applications*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1975.

Gowan, Susanne, *et al. Moving Toward a New Society*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1979.

Guillaumin, Colette. "Pratique du pouvoir et idée de nature: (1) L'appropriation des femmes, and (2) Le discours de la nature," *Questions féministes*, Vols. 2 and 3, 1978.

Harford, Barbara and Sarah Hopkins, editors. *Greenham Common: Women at the Wire*. London: Women's Press, 1984.

Hartmann, Heidi. "The family as the locus of gender, class and political struggle." *Signs*, Vol. 6 No. 3, 1981.

Hermann, Judith with Lisa Hirschman. *Father-daughter Incest*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

ISIS. *Women in Development*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1984.

ISIS. Women's International Bulletin No. 26, Special Issue on Women for Peace. 1983.

Johnson, Allan Griswold. "On the Prevalence of Rape in the United States." *Signs*, Vol. 6 No. 1, 1980.

Jones, Lynne, editor. *Keeping the Peace*. London: Women's Press, 1983.

Keeler, Jane and Elizabeth Shein. "Despair: A Call to Life. The experience of anti-nuclear activists in Ottawa." Unpublished MSW Essay. Ottawa: Carleton University, 1983.

Koen, Susan, *et al. Ain't nowhere we can run. A handbook for women on the nuclear mentality*. Norwich, Vermont: Women Against Nuclear Destruction, 1980.

Lernoux, Penny. *Cry of the People*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.

Luxton, Meg. *More than a Labour of Love*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1980.

MacLeod, Linda. *Wife Battering in Canada*. Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1980.

Macy, Joanna. *Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1983.

Malamuth, Neil. "Rape Proclivity among Males." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 37 No. 4, 1981.

Malamuth, Neil and John Briere. "Self Assessed Rape Proclivity." Paper given to the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles. 1981.

McAllister, Pam, editor. *Reweaving the Web of Life. Feminism and Nonviolence*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1982.

McWaters, Barry, editor. *Gaia. Our World in Transformation*. San Francisco: Evolutionary Press, 1984.

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature: Women, ecology and the scientific revolution*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980.

Meyerding, Jane, editor. *We are all Part of One Another. A Barbara Deming Reader*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1984.

Meyers, Norman, *et al. Gaia. An atlas of planetary management*. New York: Doubleday, 1984.

Michalowski, Helen. "The army will make a man out of you" in Pam McAllister, editor, *Reweaving the Web of Life*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1982.

Miller, Alice. *For Your Own Good. Hidden cruelty in childrearing and the roots of violence*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983.

Moscovitch, Alan, editor. *Inequality*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

New Internationalist. Special Issue on Women and Development, July 1984.

New Internationalist. Special Issue on Violence, June 1984.

Ng, Roxana. "Immigrant Housewives in Canada: A methodological note." *Atlantis*, Vol. 8 No. 1, Fall 1982.

Oldring Sydiaha, Joanne. "Delegate three people to tell you you're sane." Unpublished manuscript, 1985.

Pearce, Diana. "The feminization of poverty" in Karen Wolk Feinstein, editor, *Working Women and Families*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979.

Peavey, Fran. *Heart Politics*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1985.

Piercy, Marge. *Woman on the Edge of Time*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1980.

Pilon, Debra. "Women's arms embrace Seneca." *Herizons*, December 1983.

Project on the Present Danger. Citizens Network. Center for Religion, Ethics and Social Responsibility. Cornell University. 1984.

Radical Teacher. "Looking for Peace Studies." Special Issue, June 1984.

Rapp, Rayna, Ellen Ross and Renata Bridenthal. "Examining Family History." *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 5 No. 1, 1979.

Reardon, Betty. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Institute for World Order, 1985.

Reardon, Betty. "A gender analysis of militarism and sexist repression: A suggested research agenda." *Bulletin of the International Peace Research Association*. Summer 1983.

Reeves Sanday, Peggy. "The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 37 No. 1, Fall 1981.

Reynaud, Emmanuel. *Holy Virility. The social construction of masculinity*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Rich, Adrienne. *On Lies, Secrets and Silence*. New York: Norton, 1979.

Roberts, Barbara. "A Peaceful World for Women. Peace education taking gender into account." *History and Social Science Teacher*. Special Issue on Peace Education, February/March 1985.

Roberts, Barbara. "The death of machothink: Feminist research and the transformation of peace studies." *Women's Studies International Forum*, Fall 1984.

Roberts, Barbara. "No safe place: The war against women." *Our Generation*, Spring 1983(a).

Roberts, Barbara. "All our lives. Sexual assault and other 'normal' activities." *Canadian Woman Studies*, August/September 1983(b).

Roberts, Barbara. "Peace studies and the war against women." Paper given to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association, Ottawa. 1982.

Roberts, Barbara and Danielle Juteau Lee. "Ethnicity and femininity: (d)'après nos expériences" in Barbara Roberts and Danielle Juteau Lee, editors, *Ethnicity and Femininity*. Special Issue of *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, January 1981.

Rogers, Barbara. *The Domestication of Women. Discrimination in developing societies*. London: Tavistock, 1980.

Rosenberg, Marshall. *A model for nonviolent communication*. Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1983.

Rubin, Josephine. "A feminist world, please." *Ninth Annual Conference of the International Peace Research Association*. Orillia, Ontario, June 21-26, 1981.

Rubin, Lillian. *Worlds of Pain: Life in a working-class family*. New York: Basic, 1976.

Ruddick, Sara. "Preservative Love and Military Destruction. Reflections on mothering and peace" in Joyce Trebilcot, editor, *Mothering. Essays in Feminist Theory*. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield Adams, 1983.

Ruddick, Sara. "Pacifying the Forces. Drafting women in the interest of peace." *Signs*, Vol. 8 No. 3, 1983.

Rush, Florence. *The Best Kept Secret. Sexual abuse of children*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.

Russell, Peter. *The Global Brain: Speculations on the evolutionary leap to planetary consciousness*. Los Angeles: JP Tarcher, 1983.

Sampson, Anthony. *The Arms Bazaar: The companies, the dealers, the bribes, from Vickers to Lockheed*. Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977.

Sherman, J. and E. Beck, editors. *The Prism of Sex*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

Sivard, Ruth. *World Military Expenditures*. Washington, DC: World Priorities, 1983.

Smith, Dan and Ron Smith. *The Economics of Militarism*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Smith, Dorothy. "The experienced world *as* problematic: A feminist method." Sorokin Lecture No. 12, University of Saskatchewan. 1981.

Smith, Dorothy. "On Sociological Description: A Method from Marx." *Human Studies*, Vol. 4, 1981.

Smith, Dorothy. "A Sociology for Women" in J. Sherman and E. Beck, editors, *The Prism of Sex*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

Smith, Dorothy. "A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's exclusion from man's culture." *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 1, 1978.

Smith, Dorothy. "Some Implications of a Sociology for Women" in H. Waehrer and N. Glazer, editors, *Woman in a Man-made World*. Second Edition. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.

Smith, Dorothy. "Ideological Structures and How Women are Excluded." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 12 No. 4 Part 1, 1975.

Smith, Dorothy. "The Social Construction of Documentary Reality." *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 44, No. 4, 1974.

Spender, Dale. *Invisible Women and the Schooling Scandal*. London: Writers and Readers, 1982.

Spender, Dale, and Elizabeth Sarah, editors. *Learning to Lose. Sexism and Education.* London: Women's Press, 1980.
Spretnak, Charlene. *The Politics of Women's Spirituality.* New York: Anchor, 1982.
Stacey, William and Anson Shupe. *Domestic Violence in America.* Boston: Beacon, 1983.
Starhawk. *Dreaming the Dark. Magic, sex and politics.* Boston: Beacon, 1982.
Stark-Adamec, Cannie and Robert Adamec. "Aggression by Men against Women: Adaptation or Aberration?." *International Journal of Women's Studies,* Vol. 1, 1982.
Starrett, Barbara. "The Metaphors of Power" in Charlene Spretnak, editor, *The Politics of Women's Spirituality.* New York: Anchor, 1982.
Stiehm, Judith Hicks. "The Protected, the Protector, and the Defender." *Women's Studies International Forum,* Vol. 5 Nos. 3/4, 1982.
Strange, Penny *It'll make a man of you. A feminist view of the arms race.* Nottingham, England: Peace News/Mushroom Press, 1983.
Therapy Now. Special Issue on Living in the Nuclear Age. Summer 1984.
Thompson, Jane. *Learning Liberation: Women's response to men's education.* London: Croom Helm, 1983.
Thurman, Judith. "Breaking the Mother-daughter Code. An interview with Nancy Chodorow." *Ms,* September 1982.
Trebilcot, Joyce, editor. *Mothering. Essays in feminist theory.* Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield Adams, 1983.
Van Gelder, Lindsy. "Carol Gilligan: Leader for a different kind of future." *Ms,* January 1984.
Vellacott, Jo. "Women, Peace and Power" in Pam McAllister, editor, *Reweaving the Web of Life.* Philadelphia: New Society Press, 1983.
Waehrer, H. and N. Glazer, editors. *Woman in a Man-made World,* Second Edition. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.
Weisstein, Naomi. "Psychology Constructs the Female" in Vivian Gornick and Barbara Moran, editors, *Women and Society. Studies in Power and Powerlessness.* New York: Bantam, 1971.
Whisker, Brenda, *et al.*, editors. *Breaching the Peace. A collection of radical feminist papers.* London: Only Women Press, 1983.
Wiser, Alice. "Peace on Earth, Goodwill toward Women." Paper given to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association, Guelph, Ontario, June 9, 1984.
Wiser, Alice. "Sexism and the Religious Society of Friends." *Friendly Woman,* Spring 1984.
Wiser, Alice. "Sexism, power and peace." *Friendly Journal,* May 1, 1982.
Wiser, Alice and Barbara Roberts. Unpublished data on women's experiences in peacemaking and conflict resolution, 1985.
Woodcock, Bruce. *Male Mythologies. John Fowler and Masculinity.* Brighton: Harvester, 1984.
Woolf, Virginia. *Three Guineas.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.